

**ICANN Transcription
Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
Tuesday 08 April 2014 at 2000 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group call on the Tuesday 08 April 2014 at 20:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-dmpm-20140408-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#apr>

Attendees:

Marinel Rosca - Individual
Tony Onorato - Individual
Jonathan Zuck - IPC
Janiver Ngnoulaye - Individual
Sonigitu Ekpe – NCUC
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Adamu B Ishiaku – Non Commercial
Nenad Orlic – ISPC
Sebastien Bachollet – ALAC
Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Jeremy Beale - SOI
Olevie Kouame – NPOC

Apologies:

Magaly Pazello – NCUC
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Jay Daley - SOI

ICANN staff:

Mary Wong
Amy Bivins
Berry Cobb
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: ...is being recorded.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group on the 8th of April 2014.

On the call today we have Nenad Orlic, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Adamu Ishiaku, Sebastien Bachollet, Tony Onorato, Marinel Rosca, Jeremy Beale, Jonathan Zuck, Graeme Bunton and Sonigitu Ekpe.

We have apologies from Magaly Pazello, Rudi Vansnick and Jay Daley. From Staff we have Berry Cobb, Amy Bivins and myself, Terri Agnew. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Jonathan Zuck.

Jonathan Zuck: Well welcome. Can everyone hear me all right?

Janiver Ngnoulaye: Yes. Yes I can.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Perfect.

Jonathan Zuck: Great. Excellent. Okay so I guess the first thing we should do is a roll call of everybody that's on. The system seems to handle most of that nowadays. Should we just ask for people that are on but are not listed in the Adobe Connect?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jonathan, Terri just did that.

Jonathan Zuck: Oh okay. Sorry I was dialing back in. All right, excellent. So I guess our first order of business is to deal with the departure of Mikey. So does anybody want to sort of begin the queue of how you want to proceed, or anyone want to volunteer to be the new Working Group Chair or nominate someone?

Berry Cobb: And Jonathan this is Berry. Just to provide some background - so in previous calls, you know, we did agree to have Mikey as the Chair and we also had three Co-Chairs assigned to the Working Group.

As members may have saw in the list last night Mikey did step down from ICANN, thus we need to find a new Chair and as well today unfortunately given the apologies Rudi and Olevie from - both from NPOC were not able to join the call.

So right now Jonathan Zuck is standing as the Chair for today's call and as he stated we do need to search for a new Chair. Given the lightness of our overall attendance and also given the number of persons that signed up for the Working Group from our session in Singapore, we'll probably - we'll have a bigger group to choose from, but it should be noted that we'll probably have to take a formal call for a Chair out to the list just so that the whole Working Group is informed. So back over to you Jonathan. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay so I guess procedurally I - what we've just decided to do is put out a formal call to the list for people that are interested in being the Work Group Chair. Is that right Berry?

Berry Cobb: That is correct just given the number of members that we have on the group and not everybody being available here today. But I do see Cheryl's hand raised as well.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Jonathan. Cheryl for the transcript record. I agree totally we need to go out to the list. What I however am a little concerned about is that chairing a group, particularly one as diverse as this group is, is not something for a newbie.

I think I'd encourage newbies and people with their learner and provisional license plates on to step up and lead working teams or subgroups. I certainly encourage them to be assistants in leadership roles such as in the Vice-Chair positions.

But if we are making a call and I agree we do need to make a call to the list, I think the term experienced needs to come in because this will live or die by the Chair's capabilities.

To that end I have absolute comfort and faith in Jonathan taking this as an interim role. He's very good at herding cats and that's what we need. So yes make a call by all means but please use the term experienced.

I just really think that this particular game is too darn important to float around and just be a learning experience. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay anyone else want to speak to this topic? Oh Janiver go ahead. Janiver? You have your hand up.

Janiver Ngnoulaye: Hello?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes.

Janiver Ngnoulaye: Hello?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes we can hear you.

Janiver Ngnoulaye: Hello? Yes my question is has any person shown an interest?

Jonathan Zuck: Well can you say that again? I'm sorry. I didn't understand.

Janiver Ngnoulaye: Has anybody shown interest of becoming the Chair/Chairman,
Working Group Chairman?

Jonathan Zuck: Well that's, I mean, this is very sudden Janiver --the announcement by
Mikey -- and so I think that we haven't even really opened the
conversation until just this minute...

Janiver Ngnoulaye: I think...

Jonathan Zuck: ...for people to express their interests.

Janiver Ngnoulaye: Okay. Okay. Yes I - okay I think it's okay with me now. Yes my mic
was muted. I'm sorry. I think someone is hearing me now?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Janiver Ngnoulaye: Is it all clear? The line is so clear with me now?

Berry Cobb: Yes. Yes. Yes it is.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes it is.

Janiver Ngnoulaye: Okay thank you. Thank you. Okay I'm start - I start by greeting everyone. I'm happy to join you at this meeting. I just told what I suggest that since we have three Co-Chairs maybe I suggest that the first on the list can move to the Chair position. What are you - what do you think about that?

This is what I suggest that the first one on the list because I - we have three people on the - as the Co-Chair. If the first one can move to the Chair position and now we will - it will remain two people and the Co-Chair. What are you think about this suggestion? I thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks Janiver. Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi. Thanks. Wasn't Sonigitu on the list first?

Jonathan Zuck: Who? I'm sorry? Oh I thought you had raised your hand first. He's above you in the list listed so I...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Oh well I'm happy to continue. I just know he does support Janiver's comment in the chat. Janiver I hear - and Cheryl for the record. I hear and understand and indeed agree with what you say.

But as - and it's a big but - as Berry pointed out our Work Group has expanded considerably with new people, excuse me, since the meeting in Singapore.

And it is important that with Mikey stepping down that there is opportunity for other people to step up as well. Now that said of course what you've got in Jonathan is exactly what you've proposed.

The only one of the Vice-Chairs who's present today is stepping in and acting in the capacity of Chair. In other words it's exactly what should happen with Vice-Chairs.

It may come to pass of course that Jonathan or one of the Vice-Chairs is indeed confirmed as Chair. But I think the call does need to go out. It does of course mean that if one of the three Vice-Chairs moves up to Chair that that would be leaving us two Vice-Chairs and that's excellent.

However the other alternative, which the group may decide to do, is to rotate through the three Vice-Chairs and again I'm perfectly happy with that if indeed that is the will of the group.

But I keep coming back to we need people with experience. And if the three Vice-Chairs do choose to rotate then I would suggest they need to have excellent leadership meetings and regular leadership meetings so that they will in concert to make sure that the management of the meetings and the amount of work that goes on between meetings is properly managed.

I certainly think that the Vice-Chair stepping up as we've got now is the right thing to do, and I don't mind how long he stays. You know, Jonathan can sit here in this capacity now for as long as it takes to have the committee as a whole sort this out.

But I keep coming back to whoever we have has to be, A, experienced; and B, might I suggest actually present at enough meetings. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks Cheryl. Sonigitu?

Sonigitu Ekpe: Hi. Good. I think I support Janiver comment although Rudi is not around. I could also suggest Jonathan Chair at this moment. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. All right, thank you. I guess as Cheryl said I'm just - I'm the Acting Chair I guess at least for the duration of this call. And I, you know, one of the three of us will continue to play that role until we select a new Work Group Chair.

And I'm happy to have my name in the hopper but I think it does make sense with the greatly expanded membership as Berry mentioned to find out what interest there is and make sure that everybody has a chance to put their name in the hat.

And I agree with Cheryl that this is a complicated charter in many respects, and so it's probably not a role for a newbie. There's a lot of competing interests and a lot of complexity to the things that we'll be trying to sort out and accomplish.

So I think the next step will be to put out a call to the broader membership list. And Berry has said that he'll take the action item of sending that list out to a call for volunteers and then we'll pick this conversation back up I guess on the list.

Unless there's anybody else that wants to speak to this issue, I mean, I know we'll all miss Mikey. I don't know. I hope his absence isn't permanent but he obviously needed a break, and he's been at it for quite a while and in a lot of Work Groups at once and was spread pretty thin and so, you know, we certainly wish him well in his garden.

Anyone else that wants to speak to the issue of a new Chair? I think one of the interesting aspects of this Working Group is that it's going to end up having a lot of subcommittees or sub-Working Groups or however we want to phrase it because there's a lot of work and research to be done, you know, in the context of this group.

So the role of the Work Group Chair is going to be varied, and I think we're going to have a lot of sort of subgroup Chairs as we try to get some of the research done associated with our work plan so I think that'll be interesting.

Okay so we're boring people now I guess with this topic. So the next thing on the agenda is the Singapore recap. And I think we had a very early morning meeting in Singapore and expected that no one would show up in fact and that we would just be talking to ourselves at the, you know, at the meeting in Singapore.

And yet it was actually a fairly well attended meeting including a lot of new people to the group, some of whom Mikey had kind of recruited in

the hallway that included someone with a specialization in data mining and business intelligence from Tucows and some others that - who had specific experience that I thought, you know, that had some very interesting experience associated with it.

I think one of the biggest challenges of this group is going to be keeping to its scope. One of the big conversations that took place during the Singapore meeting had to do with the broader issue of open data and, you know, ICANN releasing broader data sets, et cetera and there was a lot of sort of good suggestions and good conversations about that.

But I think that Berry in particular did a good job to make sure that we tried to stay within the scope of what we were trying to do despite all those discussions.

So what Berry's just put up is the slides that we presented at the Singapore meeting as we talked a little bit about, you know, our mission and scope. And so some of the questions that got raised are here on the slides and I think you all saw these on the list prior to the Singapore meeting.

And I think again we want to just sort of refine our scope and go over that and then begin to talk about what a plan of work would be to begin to tackle the various outcomes that we've set for ourselves.

So I don't know the best way to proceed. We've seen some of this in the offline list but looking at this first slide and the questions that are highlighted there, are there things that people have questions about or don't understand what we're trying to get to?

And then perhaps Berry or I can answer those questions so that we can narrow down our scope and begin to talk about how we're going to tackle this. Berry yes go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Jonathan. This is Berry. I think one of the biggest things that you definitely touched upon is maintaining our scope and that's certainly been a conversation not only that we more less ended with in Singapore, but as well as on the list given some other topics relative to the - I think the WHOIS studies and some of that aspect.

So most importantly is scope will be the biggest factor and I'll reiterate that, you know, our scope is - typically is going to be within the GNSO and the Working Groups that function within the GNSO.

That said I think one of the most important bullets on these couple of slides - and for those on the phone you do have the ability to control the presentation that you see in the Adobe Connect room yourself.

But one of the biggest tasks that we're going to be having in the near-term is something that Jonathan touched on and that's the research component of this.

And I think what'll be very important for this Working Group to accomplish is that we review past use cases of Working Groups that were PDPs and non-PDPs that were performed in the past and try to garner lessons learned about, you know, how those groups functioned and what their outcomes or outputs were and how they were or were not measured, which is most importantly I think the principle around what we're trying to accomplish here.

That said I - I'm not saying that all of us will become experts across PEDNR and IRTP and other policy topics that the GNSO has addressed. But the idea is to really formulate a structure that we can help try to find a common theme across all of those by asking the right questions up front.

You know, what data does the Working Group need before addressing the policy issue? What data was needed post any policies or consensus policies that may have been developed to help measure the success or failure of that as well?

So that said I, you know, I do ask that the Working Group members take a really close look at the items that we have listed in the charter. And without a doubt this research will be our next step as well as once we've garnered some initial information our - in our due diligence then we'll also be looking to put together a call out to the SOs and ACs for some of their input as to what steps we should be taking in other principles or data metrics and gathering that other SO and AC groups may be doing. Thank you Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes that's - you're right Berry. And I think one of the clarifications that we really tried to put a point on in the meeting in Singapore was that - was the focus on the fact that we're a non-policy Working Group.

And I think that that is going to be confusing for us because we're all used to being on policy Working Groups, but I think it's also what creates the biggest opportunity for the Working Group.

So what we're going to be doing is not looking at any specific metrics, but instead looking at the past in terms of where there were opportunities to make use - better use of data both in constructing policy to begin with and potentially reviewing the policy after the fact, a concept which in and of itself is somewhat foreign I think.

And then perhaps building a kind of toolkit in terms of the worksheets for the charter drafting process, worksheets for the policy development process, you know, potential templates, et cetera and policies around data collection and analysis and protection because one of the issues is that some of the data that we might want to collect will have competitive, you know, purposes generally, et cetera and so trying to come out with some of those use cases basically about how and when we might need data and what kind of protections we need to put in place, how we need to ask for it and what assurances we need to make when we do.

I think answering some of those questions so that it becomes a kind of a checklist and process model that Work Groups can choose to use going forward I think is the exciting work of this Working Group.

I mean, it may eventually lead to a strengthening of some of the language around using data in the context of Work Groups, but that's not our charter either.

Ours is really to figure out the best way to streamline the use of data inside Working Groups, suggest some of the use cases and what's - that might be needed and make sure that we've thought through the best ways to make use of it and to protect its, you know, its integrity

while we're using it. Does that make sense everyone? Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Jonathan. Cheryl for the record. It makes absolute sense and I just - or not only absolutely supportive of it. I just wondered if it might be useful if I think just a moment to give some examples of the variability that has come from the Work Groups that I've previously been involved with in GNSO.

And I just wanted to go back to PEDNR as an example of where valuable data was collected but it was collected by accident, not by design. And in my perfect world in this future model that we will be proposing it is the type of situation where one could start at the chartering or even the analysis of the issues.

It's very much before even the formation of the group where there will be value of collection of data, and this can be anecdotal or what I like to think of as the more useful parametric data.

In PEDNR for example there was - it was one of the first times I'd seen extensive questionnaires and collection of information that was done within a Work Group.

Now that's all very useful but it would've been perhaps a good decision or at least a good thing to have explored a decision about how much data might've been valuable to have had coming into the Work Group, in other words collected from external sources or sources within ICANN and in the case of compliance we have a fairly decent resource that we can pull on.

But what happened at PEDNR is the members of the Work Group were contributors to data collected, and that in itself brings in both problem and opportunity.

So again there's another decision on what degree of waiting, how we identify the difference between material data that's been brought together to a Work Group by the Work Group and that's resources from outside.

So there's all sorts of - I'd like to think of it as decision points through a data usefulness and identification flowchart that we may perhaps come up with at the end of all of this.

But anyway that's my utopia and one tiny bit of experience that I just wanted to share. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks Cheryl. Is there anyone else that wants to be in the queue? So, I mean, I think, you know, jumping off from that example Cheryl I think that that's exactly what we want to do.

I mean, you know, it's a - I think it would be nirvana if, you know, data got used and the policies were reviewed on the basis of changes to that data later on.

And, I mean, that's the - that would be an exciting development I think in many respects. I think that as Berry mentioned the first big chunk of work is actually going to be the review of a bunch of policy development processes that have taken place in the past, perhaps both within the GNSO and outside of the GNSO.

Even though our particular mission - our remit is to focus on the GNSO, we should look for good case studies in which data was either helpful or would've been helpful and to try and construct some of the flowcharts as you say them or checklists as I'm calling them, et cetera.

I wonder if perhaps the first task that we might try to engage in as a group is to come up with like a list of questions that we would ask of each of these case studies.

In other words try to come up with a series of say 10 to 15 questions that we try to answer about each of these case studies that we come up with so that we end up with a somewhat structured result set from our research.

You know, questions like is the problem being addressed - one in which data plays a role for example? Is - was data collected or not collected? If it was collected, you know, how was it used?

If it was not why? What were the concerns that prevented the collection of the data and so on, questions like that so that we end up then with a lot of I think as I said a series of case studies if you will, a series of use cases that are examples of that we want to try and - to accommodate in our future recommendations.

Does that make sense as a kind of a start to a work plan before we launch into the case studies themselves? Jeremy, go ahead. Jeremy you might be on the mute.

I can't hear you. Can you look in the upper left hand corner to see if you've muted your microphone?

Jeremy Beale: Yes.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay there you go.

Jeremy Beale: Yes.

Jonathan Zuck: We can hear you now. Go ahead. Was that you saying yes? All right.
Okay Jeremy are you able to call in via the phone rather than using the
microphone of your computer?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You could get a dial out Jeremy if you want to - Cheryl here.
If you want to put a phone number in the Staff can organize a dial out if
that's easier.

Jonathan Zuck: Terri do you want to take this offline with Jeremy and try to get him into
the audio universe?

Terri Agnew: Yes I'm happy to do that.

Jonathan Zuck: Thank you Terri. Jeremy we'll come back to you once we can hear
you. Does anyone else want to speak to the idea of some questions?
Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Cheryl again for the record and I have my
grandchildren on Wednesday mornings so all background noise is
singing. Believe me it's not from me.

Jonathan Zuck: Good clarification. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, you know, I don't want to be accused of being a happy person mixing in that I'm kind and compassionate and that would ruin my reputation.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No in all seriousness, yes Jonathan I like that concept. What I'm wondering however - this is one of these moments and there are going to be many of them where we're going to miss Mikey.

I immediately saw his charts coming up in my mind while you were talking, so I had this mind map thing happening while you were talking Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Sure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I'm wondering whether a couple of us and I am willing to help on this could put up a - not a definitive list but a starting point of some of these questions.

And perhaps if we put that together and distribute it in enough time for people to consider before our next call, it would at least give us something to share and then to embellish and build on.

And I think we probably need two - there's going to be many times and maybe more than one way of doing things. I think that the checklist process where the exemplar questions you've suggested Jonathan is one way of doing it and it's a way we need to pursue.

But I also think the - that at a higher level critical points and decision points and flowcharts - think more of that needs to be done. So Jonathan I'm sure you've got a couple of questions in mind.

I know I certainly do and I'd be very surprised if Berry and others don't. I know Berry won't be surprised. You know, I'm going to start talking at one point about the value of parametric versus non-parametrics and things like that.

So before we get into those weeds let's do some sort of high level stuff, and then we might find that your work teams kind of naturally flow from some of that because let's be honest.

If one hasn't delved into the thrill-packed and exciting world of non-parametric analysis, you're going to blow us over...

Jonathan Zuck: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...at that point. So we don't want to have people doing analysis and working on things that they're not comfortable with, so maybe some high level stuff and it might be certainly a, you know, maybe a group of three or four people, maybe five could put some of those questions and a bit of flow in together.

Anyway that's my proposal and it's supportive of yours but an embellishment. Thanks Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Thank you for your embellishment. I can always count on you to embellish so I appreciate it, and I think that it's a good suggestion. I wonder if we should be doing any kind of a brainstorming at this point.

I mean, I - the - I'm happy to take over the mind mapping activities in terms of the product that we - that we circulate or the way that we discuss this. I'll come prepared to go over these questions on the next meeting in a mind map format because there are some conditionals and things like that probably in the questions that we'll address.

Jeremy go ahead.

Jeremy Beale: Can you hear me now?

Jonathan Zuck: We can.

Jeremy Beale: Okay good. Sorry about that. I don't know what was going on but I'm doing it from a mobile and it's the first time I've tried doing it where we connect from mobile.

So that's something to do with it. I was just saying I was - I'm a newbie here in terms of the working group or in terms of GNSO working groups.

And I was just - I'm - I think the case study approach is really, really useful. But I just - I think we almost need some questions about the case studies beforehand.

And I don't mean anything complicated. But what I'm thinking of is the - in the sense we need to explicitly know what we're talking about in terms of it being a multi stakeholder process we're looking at so that in that sense it's a bit like a collaborative R&D program in terms of (unintelligible) sharing.

You've got people with proprietary data and they share it. And this goes throughout the whole process I presume.

But then there might be instances where data that is not of that kind wants to also be brought in. So that would fit with the mapping exercise.

I think there are sort of levels in that sense of data and of the sharing that would be appropriate for it. So it might be useful to think about that when looking at the case studies.

Because the case studies might only be a one type of sharing that has occurred and something might have been missing. And unless we have that explicit perspective we will miss what wasn't there because no one thought about having it there if you get what I mean.

Jonathan Zuck: I do Jeremy and that's why I'm actually raising this issue of coming up with - I mean one way to think of it is that we're going to compile a list of past policy development processes to evaluate as case studies. And divide up into research teams.

And what we need to do is come up with an RFP for those research teams. In other words we, you know, are asking them to come back with an analysis of that particular process.

And I think that it behooves us to come up with a structure for that analysis so that the work that we get back is comprehensive as you say and somewhat structured and consistent across those case studies to the degree possible. And so that's why I think that the next

process is probably coming up with those very questions that we want to make sure that people are looking at, you know, in the context of each of those case studies.

And the question will also - the questions will also help us to determine I think as you're saying Jeremy that we have identified sufficient case studies to cover the questions being asked. Because there will certainly be some questions that are applicable to some case studies and not to others.

So I think coming up with the questions to which we want answers is the next step. That seems to be where we're headed.

And Cheryl would like to embellish.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Jonathan. Cheryl for the record.

Cheryl always like to embellish. You know that.

But in fact what I'm going to do is not so much embellish as take a parallel them this time. Just looking at the talent we've got in this room today -- in the (unintelligible) connect room today -- and it's a mix.

I see, you know, old war horses from many a PDT working group and I see people who've been involved in different styles of either multi stakeholder or less than multi stakeholder creations of work products. To that end and being aware that we do have even more people coming onboard and recognizing that it is a rare time when in a teleconference you're going to have everyone together sadly but, you

know, you are always going to get some people who just aren't able to join our call.

I wonder if we could also put together a little briefing note I guess would be the best way of describing it of what has typically happened in the birth and creation of even a hypothetical -- but we could use actual examples -- of policy development process. Just so everyone knows what tends to happen to date.

You know, how does a problem even get identified? How does a potential problem get ratified and agreed that it's a problem?

How does a problem -- if it is a problem statement that is agreed to -- then become a work piece that a work group is then chartered to deal with. Do you know what I mean?

Just the care and seeding of how these things normally happen. Without getting into the details yet just so we know to date what has happened in an anecdotal way.

And there may be variability. I believe there is variability in how those things happen and we can identify that.

And I'm thinking, you know, with Mary and yourself, Jonathan, and again, you know, a few others I guess I could kind of put my hand up sometimes we could put that sort of note out. And that would mean everyone understands how things have tended to go.

Not saying that's a good, bad or indifferent model. But just an identification of this is what tends to happen. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks Cheryl. I mean we have to decide whether we want someone idealistic or someone cynical to draw that up.

I guess that'd be...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well both - or both.

Jonathan Zuck: That's the question. Okay. Anyone else want to comment on that? Does that seem - would the people that are on the group feel like they would benefit from I guess a kind of a primer on the PDP process as it currently stands above and beyond what's available on the newbie portion of the ICANN website, et cetera?

So Jeremy yeah I guess check it - check your green check mark if you think that the exercise Cheryl is describing would be a beneficial one of a kind of an existing flow chart as a place to work from where we might be changing some of the - or proposing changes to some of those pathways as they currently exist at least in the abstract and anecdotally.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jonathan Cheryl here again. There's a wealth of resource material that can be pulled on for that.

I don't think it's going to be a complicated task. But I'm particularly looking maybe at Mary accessing some of the things that (unintelligible) have used in the past.

And then, you know, we sort of put it together in a slightly new form, that's all. Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: Mary how do you feel about being a part of that process? She has a muted microphone but I'm assuming she's on the phone.

Are you on the phone Mary?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: She says she's happy to help. So, you know.

Jonathan Zuck: There. I see it down there on the - I'm waiting for the microphone to come unmuted or something. So I mean I think that's a good idea in that I think what we are looking at is sort of recommendations around PDP process.

And so if - Cheryl if you and Mary want to kind of take charge of coming up with that and I'm happy to help if there's - if you want help on the graphical side of that or anything like that let me know. But if you guys are willing to take charge of coming up with at least a straw man for that and then we'll put it up for discussion to make sure that we've sort of caught the angles that are necessary to catch then why don't we go ahead and do that.

And because it will become a discussion piece for what the - where the entry points are in the process for what it is that we're recommending potentially. Okay?

You (unintelligible) yeah we've kind of moved past Item 3 (Olivier). It's we're sort of on the charter and the work plan that have sort of munched together.

Okay? Anybody else have any comments on things that we ought to do before we dive into the case studies? How should we go about coming up with the case studies?

I know Berry has a start on that. Is that something we should just start a list of so staff can begin to collect those together and then add to a list that Berry's gotten started?

Berry go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thanks Jonathan. This is Berry.

Yes I've basically started compiling a list of all of the past efforts that have occurred within the GNSO, within the chat I had included a link to basically our archive page that contains most of the previous efforts. We're still in the middle of documenting some of the things that occurred 2004 and previous.

But I've taken the action to create a list to send out to our mailing list of all of the possible ones. And I'm sure I won't be able to capture everything.

But it'll at least be a brain sparker that other members can contribute to so that we get an overall list. And then we can at least, you know, we'll start with everything thrown against the wall and then we'll pick which ones that seem the most relevant to our exercise and go from there.

But the primary component is the archival of past efforts. I think there was some discussion about some of the Whois related studies and we can include that as well.

And then I also think that it was sent out to the list shortly after our session in Singapore -- the BSSA group had put together some components about their data collection and the realm of that. So I'll be sure to include that and then we can improve upon it on the list and talk about it more with - at our next call.

Jonathan Zuck: All right that makes sense. Jeremy?

Jeremy Beale: Can you hear me?

Jonathan Zuck: We can.

Jeremy Beale: Okay good. Would it also be useful to develop other case studies in parallel that aren't just ones about what, you know, the GNSO PDP process? What I'm thinking of is following on from what I said previously which is that in some cases what we're trying to do or what is being attempted within the GNSO is a bit like collaborative R&D.

To a certain extent it's like (unintelligible) competitive R&D. And in other respects it's probably something else.

But what I'm thinking of is that would be maybe something to look at after the case studies of what has already occurred within the GNSO. That might throw some light again onto ways that the GNSO could have resolved issues in a different way through taking external ones about those things.

Jonathan Zuck: Jeremy that sounds good to me. I think what we may find by examining a lot of the GNSO case studies is all the things that we could have done and didn't.

And in many instances -- there'll be some cases where that's not the case. But perhaps looking at some successful data driven, you know, policy or as you're saying maybe even product development processes.

I don't want to get too far down a rabbit hole with that obviously. But coming up with some examples of success will be a useful to suggest how analogous processes might be used inside the GNSO.

Am I capturing your recommendation?

Jeremy Beale: Absolutely.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay excellent. And I also don't want to lose track of Cheryl's comment that I think this extends to charter drafting as well.

I mean and so I think that's definitely an important part of our process analysis and what the entry points into that are as well. Because I think data is useful in the context of chartering individual working groups as well.

Other questions -- things that people want to bring up in terms of our work plan? I mean my feeling is that what we will do is come up with kind of RFPs for these research efforts -- these questionnaires that each of the research teams will split into teams to look at.

We'll go through these case studies and probably as a group decide which ones seem to be worth using as, you know, go through these past efforts and look at which ones were most viable as case studies. And then divide up and analyze them based on the questionnaires that we come up with.

And I think once we have our results is probably the time to have a more thorough discussion about what our work product will be. I'm not entirely sure it's something that we need to predetermine now as part of our work plan.,

I think we have a general idea of what that work product might be in terms of process recommendations, policies, you know, commitments around data, et cetera. But my guess is that we'll have a better understanding of what our actual work product should be once we've gotten through the case study approach.

Does anybody disagree with that and think that we should delve into more detail of what our work product will be? Prior to the case studies I guess that's my question to the group.

Okay excellent. So that's - I think that'll be the general flow of what we do.

The - so all I'm going to ask now is who feels like they have some good questions in mind that should be part of our first shot at this questionnaire? I think so far it's me and Berry.

But if - whoever's interested in being a part of that subgroup as opposed to the current PDP process subgroup -- this is the

questionnaire subgroup -- I guess please click your green check mark. And that'll be - we'll get going on this outside of this call to come up with a decent list of questions as a starting point for the conversation on the next call.

So check your button here I guess if you're interested. And then Berry will probably also put out a call to the group as they - as that list of questions begins to develop.

I've got Berry. (Graham) did you mean to say that you were volunteering?

And (unintelligible), you're volunteering for the questionnaire subgroup? All right.

Anyone else? Berry I'm assuming you're sort of capturing this.

It might be you, mean and (unintelligible). All right.

Man: Yes.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay so I think that's how we'll proceed. We have these two - and Tony are you volunteering?

All right. He's going to type.

Yes. Okay good. Excellent. We have our subgroup.

And I guess the last question on our agenda has to do with meeting times. And how we want to schedule them going forward.

Do we want to do alternating times so that people have an opportunity to be more awake than they are normally on the call? And I'm going to hand that over to Berry to describe the problem for us.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you Jonathan. Just real quick before I step into the meeting schedule.

What I have posted here in the AC room is kind of our first draft of our overall work plan. You really can't see much of it here but I'll make sure to send this version out to the list.

What it does contain in here is basically a listing of what we've accomplished up to this point which is really mostly about the charter drafting exercise that occurred before this working group started. But what is important in here -- it does contain our overall milestones that we need to accomplish such as drafting and eventually getting to a draft initial report that contains some recommendations, posting a public comment against that initial report and then of course submitting the final report up to the GNSO Council.

As we start to mature some of our activities leading up to the initial report I'll be loading these into our project plan tool so that we have a better idea of duration of some of these tasks as well as some hopefully, you know, target dates in which we hope to accomplish this. You know, looking at our schedule now I don't - I think it's fair to say that, you know, it would probably be into the Los Angeles meeting before we may even come close to having any kind of draft initial report to put out for public comment.

So that's something that we'll be cognitive of. So with that said the meeting schedule -- and this is an action that I will also put out to the list -- you know, given the diversity of our working group members around the globe I think typically what we've done in the past to balance or share the burden across everyone is to create an alternating schedule.

Typically the working group does meet on a weekly basis. Although I will leave that up to the working group to ultimately decide.

Other working groups have met every other week or preferably would be a weekly basis just so that we can get our task accomplished. So what I'll be doing is sending out to the list just to confirm alternate meeting schedule times.

What you see in the agenda now is just kind of what we've used in the past -- 14 UTC and 20UTC. And every other week those times will schedule or they'll alternate.

It does make a little bit more complex in terms of scheduling. But again it's pretty much necessary given the global diversity of our group.

So when you see those out on the list please complete the doodle poll. And at least for now for next week we'll go ahead and schedule the next call to be a 20 UPC.

And hopefully we'll have completed the doodle poll and will determine the other alternate time. And at least for now I'm working off the basis that we're going to meet weekly.

Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks Berry. Is there anybody that wants to speak up on the meeting schedule or was that all clear? Anybody have any objections, suggestions on weekly versus biweekly?

Cheryl Langdon Orr: Cheryl here. Sorry I didn't put my hand up.

I think biweekly will work at the beginning because it'll allow you to have your - the work teams which will be coming out. And I think you'll get more of them as our work progresses.

It'll allow them to meet in the off week. And then obviously as we go towards meeting nodes of London and definitely Los Angeles it will probably go to weekly.

But by then your work teams should be - have already brought back their individual activities to the committee as a whole. I just think you need to make sure you've got built into the process early on the ability for your work teams to meet regularly as well. Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks Cheryl. I'm inclined to agree with what you just said.

I'm wondering if what that means is that we meet more frequently. And then once we've divided into case study teams, you know, sort of define what that frequency is and what even the purpose of the meetings are at that point until those - until that analysis is done by those - by each of those groups.

They'll probably be sort of some staggered reporting back from those research efforts that'll take place. But it might make sense to meet more frequently until we launch into that process that will by definition be significantly more sluggish when we're divided into teams and getting research done.

Anybody else want to speak to that? Janiver.

Janiver Ngnoulaye: Yes thank you. I just want to let you know that with the new - this program GNSO working group newcomer open house (unintelligible) that will be event.

I think we have to take it in account also. So I suggest that maybe at the beginning we can have biweekly meeting, biweekly meeting means one meeting every two weeks.

And then add into this program of newcomer I think would be better for me. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Perhaps we should take a vote. How many of the participants that are on the call would prefer biweekly meetings -- a meeting every other week instead of every week?

Please do your green check mark to show your preference for a biweekly meeting?

Berry Cobb: Jonathan, you know, I think, you know, again we don't have our full bench of participants on this call.

Jonathan Zuck: no that's true.

Berry Cobb: So I'll make it a third doodle poll which will basically be weekly, biweekly so that we get a good feel for that. And then the follow-up polls will be the alternating times.

Jonathan Zuck: Does doodle let you ask a binary question like that? Or do you have to use another polling device?

I didn't know doodle lets you ask either/or questions but...

Berry Cobb: Yes it does binary.

Jonathan Zuck: All right. That's good, that's good. Okay. All right.

Well thanks everyone. I think that we have a couple of subgroups going forward.

For our next meeting Berry will be putting out several messages to the group. So please watch your inbox on a number of different issues including the position of chair, the case studies and then we'll also be working on the questions and the existing flow chart if you will of the PDP process inside the GNSO.

Does anybody have any other business that they'd like to raise before we close the call?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just me - Cheryl here for the record. I just wondered Berry when you're doing the doodle poll you will be giving the alternating UTC cycle as well won't you?

Berry Cobb: Yes indeed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. I mean I have a vested interest in that moving at the other hemisphere. So thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Right.

Berry Cobb: Well I got your back.

Jonathan Zuck: (Nenad) do you want to speak?

(Nenad): Hi everybody. Yes hi everybody this (unintelligible) schedule like every two weeks or every week. I think it's for the best to pick biweekly for now and if anything comes up in the meantime the chair can (unintelligible) or something else.

For me I think the (unintelligible) working schedule is something most useful. But sorry I'm a newcomer, I don't know if there are any rules (unintelligible) that we have to meet at certain times.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay thank you. Janiver do you - is your hand still up or do you have a new comment?

Okay and (Olivier)? Are you on mute?

(Olivier): I'm (unintelligible).

Jonathan Zuck: Okay do you wish to speak?

(Olivier): (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Well I'm trying to wait to see if there's more comments people want to make. Otherwise we'll wrap up the meeting.

Okay. For the biweekly. All right (Jean-Pierre's) made his comment.

All right. Excellent. So Berry will put that poll out as well and we'll get the views of the full group on that.

Everybody's got their homework assignments. Even if you're new if you'd like to participate in one of those two processes then contact me about the questionnaire or contact Mary or Cheryl about the flow chart of existing PDP process if you want to be in on those conversations.

Meanwhile I will call the meeting to a close. Thanks everyone for participating.

Man: Thank you very much.

Woman: Thank you. And if we could stop the recordings at this time.

Man: Thanks Jonathan.

Woman: Thank you.

Coordinator: The recordings have ended.

END